



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,042	12/22/2000	William B. Whitten II	2000-0556	9058

7590 04/07/2004

Samuel H. Dworetsky
AT & T CORP.
P.O. BOX 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

MANIWANG, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/746,042

Applicant(s)

WHITTEN, WILLIAM B.

Examiner

Joseph R Maniwang

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

New corrected drawings are required in this application because Fig. 4 is an informal drawing. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liffick (U.S. Pat. No. 6,421,439), hereinafter referred to as Liffick, and further in view of Aravamudan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,301,609), hereinafter referred to as Aravamudan, or alternatively, Aravamudan in further view of Liffick.

Liffick disclosed a communication system providing user control of a contact list used for filtering incoming calls. Liffick disclosed a contact list that could be segmented into a series of sublists (see column 7, line 57 through column 8, line 5). The recipient

Art Unit: 2144

user had control over the segmented contact lists, where each list could be categorized and controlled by an accessibility level (see column 9, lines 7-55). A segmented list could be given a status level of accessibility, including blocked or non-blocked status (see column 8, lines 35-48). Liffick also disclosed associating a priority for granting accessibility to a list (see column 9, lines 45-55). This list was accessible to the user in real-time over the Internet for modification (see column 10, lines 43-49). Liffick disclosed such a contact list to be useful in monitoring an online status of another computer (see column 7, line 57 through column 8, line 5). Furthermore Liffick disclosed the preference of some of these users to "chat" with other subscribers using an associated alias (see column 9, line 56 through column 10, line 13).

While disclosing the use of a contact list for monitoring the availability of another user on the Internet and the preference of such users to chat using an associated alias, Liffick did not specifically disclose the invention in an instant messaging context.

Aravamudan disclosed a communication system utilizing an instant messaging system for providing advanced features and capabilities in existing communication systems. The system of Aravamudan was similar to that of Liffick in that incoming phone calls could be filtered according to rules specified by the recipient user. The rules were defined by a user's contact list, and by priority assigned to contacts on the list (see column 5, line 52 through column 6, line 31). The invention of Aravamudan achieved such control by making use of an industry standard instant message server and combining it with a telephone network (see column 5, lines 15-51).

While Aravamudan disclosed the use of an instant messaging contact list for controlling communications to a user, Aravamudan did not specifically disclose segmenting the contact list and specifying an accessibility level of the segmented list.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Liffick and Aravamudan to provide user control of a contact list, wherein the contact list could be segmented for the purpose of specifying an accessibility level of the segmented list in an instant messaging system. The combination of teachings would also have provided a way for designating to a segmented list a blocking/non-blocking status, a priority, and message acceptability from the senders in the segmented list. Liffick disclosed the desire for users on a network to "chat" using an alias (see column 9, line 56 through column 10, line 13), leading one of ordinary skill to consider ways of incorporating a "chat" (i.e., instant messaging) system in the invention of Liffick. Aravamudan disclosed a system similar to Liffick that incorporated such an instant messaging system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider the teachings of Aravamudan since they were a way of joining conventional phone technologies and computer instant messaging, creating a more unified system where users could gain more features and services and thus allowing for chatting in a conventional phone system (see column 1, line 59 through column 2, line 22; column 11, lines 8-45). Alternatively, Aravamudan disclosed the use of a contact list and an instant messaging system for controlling communications between a sender and a recipient user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider incorporating the control features disclosed by

Art Unit: 2144

Liffick (such as segmenting a list and specifying the accessibility level of the segmented list as blocked/not blocked or prioritized) as this control scheme provided greater user control over incoming communications from senders (see column 2, line 57 through column 3, line 4; column 13, lines 41-52).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Liffick (U.S. Pat. No. 6,403,289) disclosed a communication system providing user control of a contact list used for filtering incoming calls.

Oliver (U.S. Pat. No. 6,480,885) disclosed a method for communicating between users in a group by generating subsets of users based on user specified data.

Stimmel (U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,719) disclosed a messaging system allowing a user to specify an availability status and allowed methods for communication.

Kakuta et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,630,944) disclosed a method of chatting with the capability of creating message groups comprised of a subgroup of users based on user instructions.

Simonoff (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,460) disclosed a whiteboard system controlling a the view of a plurality of users based on their priority assignment.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R Maniwang whose telephone number is (703) 305-3179. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2144

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack B Harvey can be reached on (703)305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM


JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER